PAY

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,075	06/02/2000	Thomas J. Shafron	694231/004	7301

7590 08/26/2003

James J DeCarlo
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038

EXAMINER
VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	9

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/587,075	Applicant(s) SHAFRON, THOMAS J.	
	Examiner Tuan A Vu	Art Unit 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 June 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 June 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed June 30, 2003.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1,2, 5-7, 15, 20, 27, 28 have been amended and one new claim has been added. Claims 1-50 are now pending in the office action.

Claim Objections

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 49 as cited in Applicant's latest set of claims has been renumbered 50; i.e. the newly added claim 49 mentioned by Applicant in the response has been renamed claim 50 and appended to the original set claims 1-49.

3. Claims 20, 50 are objected to because of the following informalities: the verb used "are stored" (line 15, claim 20; line 12, claim 50) in claims should be corrected to be – is stored --. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international

application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Note: 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-17, 19, 22-36, and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoyle, USPN: 6,141,010 (hereinafter Hoyle).

As per claim 1, Hoyle discloses a method of managing resources of a multi-user software application deployed in a client-server system using a resource management program operative on a client computer (e.g. *ADM module* – Fig. 1), the method comprising:

generating a request to change the software application in response to change in user preference(e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; col. 11, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62 – Note: clicking to select an ad/banner or sending a request to download ads resources implicitly discloses generating a request for change in an application effected by the browser application or communication interface following user's selection on or preference (input) about which ads to be retrieved)

transmitting to the server system from a client the request to change the software application (e.g. col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62; col. 5, lines 24-25; Fig. 8 – Note: server responding to a request is equivalent to request being transmitted to server; formulating demographic data to provide to server is also equivalent to transmitting request form to change application based on user preference);

receiving into the client computer a preference parameter associated with a group of resources needed to accommodate the request (e.g. steps *140-142* - Fig. 8 – Note: demographic data provided to convey user preferences/settings and associated ID sent by server to user in response thereto is equivalent to receiving a preference parameter associated with data to be downloaded); and

retrieving the needed group of resources if it is not locally stored (e.g. col. 17, lines 10-25; Fig. 8 – Note: the retrieving and setting in registry of installed resources implies that the resources are not locally already stored prior to being installed).

But Hoyle does not explicitly specify determining whether the needed group of resources is stored locally on the client computer using the preference parameter. However, Hoyle discloses (e.g. col. 5, lines 26-35; col. 17, lines 10-25; Fig. 7) using demographic data, e.g. zip code, stored along with unique ID in resources for effecting the installation of appropriate advertisement resources, hence discloses some determining based on preference parameters by client. The determining as to whether the needed group of resources is stored locally is implicitly disclosed when Hoyle mentions about keeping and updating a database of advertising resources locally and replacing of banners with others dynamically based on user's input (e.g. col. 14, lines 46-58; col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, line 11; col. 14, line 59 to col. 15, line 28; col. 16, lines 44-52 – Note: storing of banner data with time priority and use of ADM module for dynamically retrieving of banner data is equivalent to knowing that resources does not locally exists).

As per claims 2 and 3, Hoyle further discloses passing (re claim 2) of the needed group of resources to the application; calling a function (e.g. display) exposed by the (re claim 3)

software application (e.g. *display, refresh, report, acquisition of advertising, data management* – col. 7, lines 4-14) including passing (e.g. col. 4, lines 27-49; Fig. 11,12) the group of needed group of resources to the application as argument (e.g. col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 2 – Note: passing program modules or passing images to GUI application is equivalent of passing group of resources as arguments).

As per claim 4, Hoyle further discloses a user interface (e.g. col. 7, lines 26-47) being generated.

As per claim 5, Hoyle further discloses from the linking of resources (e.g. col. 5, line 46-54; col. 9, lines 49-59) and loading of text strings (Fig. 5) and image data into memory (e.g. col. 7, lines 32-37).

As per claims 6 and 7, Hoyle further discloses (e) storing the needed group of resources in a memory space of the client computer (e.g. col. 7, lines 32-37); and passing the needed group of resources to the software application so as to enable the application to access the group of resources (e.g. Fig. 10; col. 9, lines 39-55 – Note: banners resource data passed to enable display in region of GUI application); and (g) generating a user interface on the client computer (Fig. 5, 5a).

As per claim 8, Hoyle further discloses a method of internationalizing a software application deployed in a client server environment; such method comprising: receiving a request from a client computer; receiving on the client computer a preference parameter associated with the group of resources; determining whether the resources is locally stored on the client computer; retrieving the group of resources if not stored on the client. These step limitations have been addressed in claim 1 above.

Hoyle further discloses storing on a server a plurality of geographic region-specific groups of resources (*Updated Components 48, Ad Database 44, Demographic Database* - Fig. 3; *locale, zone*, col. 3, lines 4-6; *city and state, zip code* - col. 17, lines 2-21; col. 17, lines 39-44 – Note: the group of resources is geographically region-specific (i.e. internationalizing) for it has characteristics related to user's geographic locations).

As per claim 9, this claim carries the same limitations as claim 2 above and incorporates the rejection in claim 2 above, except for the limitation that the group of resources is region-specific. Such limitation is being set forth and addressed in claim 8 above.

As per claims 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, these are the "internationalizing" version of respectively claims 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 above, therefore incorporate the rejections set forth respectively therein.

As per claim 15, Hoyle discloses a computer system operative with a software implemented resource manager for customizing a user interface of a software application; the computer system comprising:

a communication link with a server system (Fig. 3); and

a processor operative with the software implemented resource manager (e.g. *ADM module* – Fig. 1) to

receive from the server a preference parameter associated with a needed group of resources (e.g. steps *140-142* - Fig. 8) for customizing the user interface according to a change of user preference (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; col. 11, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62 – Note: browser input, links selection or requesting a download for ads data are equivalent to customizing an user interface according to user preferences change);

determine upon receipt of the preference parameter whether the needed group of resources associated with the parameter is stored on the client computer (re claim 1 for rationale); and

retrieve the needed group of resources associated with the above parameter from the server system (e.g. col. 17, lines 10-25; Fig. 8) so that the software application is enabled to generate a user interface of the software application using the needed group of resources (e.g. *advertisement banners* -- col. 7, lines 32-41; Fig. 10).

As per claims 16 and 17, Hoyle further discloses the client computer receives a preference parameter (re claim 16) from the server system in response to a user generated request to change (e.g. *Unique Identifier* - col. 5, lines 26-33; Fig. 8); and wherein (re claim 17) the preference is a regional setting (e.g. *locale, zone*, col. 3, lines 4-6; *zip code* - col. 17, lines 13-21; col. 17, lines 39-44 – Note: region-specific data used in accommodating user demographic preferences/settings are equivalent to region-specific setting).

As per claim 19, Hoyle further discloses that the generation of the user interface further comprises calling a function exposed by the software application, passing the needed group of resources as an argument, linking to the needed group of resources, loading text strings and image data into a memory, and generate the customized user interface using the text strings and image data. These are the same step limitations set forth and addressed in claims 3 and 5 above; hence incorporate the same respective rejections therein.

As per claim 22, Hoyle further discloses a method of modifying a toolbar interface of a browser application (Fig. 5), comprising:

generating on a client computer the toolbar interface (e.g. col. 9, lines 52-64; Fig. 5,5a) using original ads setting (i.e. a first group of resources);

receiving into a server system a request (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; col. 11, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62) to change the ads data in the browser (toolbar) interface (e.g. Fig. 5,5a);

communicating, from the server system, an unique identifier associated (e.g. steps *140-142* - Fig. 8; col. 5, lines 26-35) with advertising data (a second group of resources) needed to change the GUI (toolbar) interface to the client computer(e.g. step *144* -Fig. 8; col. 17, lines 19-44);

determining whether the second group of resources associated with the unique identifier is stored locally (e.g. col. 5, lines 26-35; col. 17, lines 10-25; Fig. 7; re claim 1 for implicit disclosure rationale); and

retrieving the advertising data (a second group of resources) associated with the unique identifier from the server system if the second group of resources is not stored locally on the client computer (e.g. col. 17, lines 10-25; step *144* - Fig. 8).

As per claim 23, Hoyle further discloses (f) passing the advertising data (a second group of resources) to the browser application so as to enable the browser application to access (Fig. 5,5a).

As per claims 24 and 25, Hoyle further discloses (re claim 23) calling; passing; (re claim 25) accessing (g); loading (h); and generating (i) as claimed, but with the second group of resources being the ads data/image/text, and loading being the linking of downloaded data to the software application, the browser application being the software application as shown in (Fig. 5,

5a), the step limitations of both instant claims are the similar to those of claims 3 and 5 above; hence incorporate the same respective rejections therein.

As per claim 26, Hoyle further discloses (f) storing; (g) passing as claimed. Those step limitations are similar to those in claim 6; hence incorporate the same respective rejections therein.

As per claim 27, Hoyle discloses a method of increasing the desirability of a user accessible web site using a browser application (Fig. 5) and a client computer, the method comprising:

maintaining a user profile (e.g. *demographic database 46* - Fig. 3) on a server system for serving the web site to the browser application, the user profile database including at least one customizable option for customizing a browser interface of the browser application (e.g. col. 11, lines 37-49; ads *banner* selection, – Fig. 10-11; *version* – Fig. 12; col. 17, lines 2-19);

permitting the user to change the customizable option (e.g. col. 11, lines 24-49; *new banner, priority, banner category*, Fig. 10-13; Fig. 7; *city and state* - col. 17, lines 2-19); and

transmitting to the client computer the resources required by the browser application to generate the customizable browser interface (e.g. step *144* - Fig. 8; Fig. 9); and

generating a browser interface on the client computer in response to the change in the customizable option (col. 11, lines 17-49; Fig. 9) the need to restart the browser application (e.g. col. 16, lines 29-48).

As per claim 28, Hoyle further discloses communicating from the server a unique identifier (e.g. steps *140-142* – Fig. 8); determining whether the group of resources is stored locally (re claim 1 for rejection); retrieving the group of resources (e.g. step *144* - Fig. 8; Fig. 9;

col. 17, lines 13-25) associated with the unique identifier from the server system; and passing the group of resources to the browser application (e.g. col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 2 ; Fig. 5, 5a).

As per claim 29, Hoyle further discloses calling and passing as claimed; but these limitations are similar to those in claims 3 and 24; hence incorporate the respective rejections of the above claims.

As per claim 30, Hoyle discloses a method of modifying a user's interaction with a software application deployed in a client server environment (e.g. col. 16, lines 28-52) without the need to re-start the application, comprising the steps of:

identifying a user interface preference of the user (e.g. col. 11, lines 24-49; Fig. 10-11; *version* – Fig. 12; col. 16, lines 24-52; col. 16, line 59 to col. 17, line 21 – Note: clicking on interface or filling form for profile and demographic setting is equivalent to user preference being identified);

identifying a preference specific resource necessary to the application to meet the user's preference (e.g. col. 17, lines 8-26; Fig. 8); and

making the preference specific resource available to the application (e.g. Fig. 5, 5a; Fig. 9).

As per claim 31, Hoyle further discloses receiving into a server system a request to change a preference setting, e.g. a new advertisement display (e.g. col. 7, lines 21-26; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62; col. 5, lines 24-25); and communicating to a client computer from the server system a preference parameter (e.g. *unique ID* – col. 5, lines 26-33; *download new banners*, Fig. 10-11; *version* – Fig. 12) identifying the user interface preference.

As per claim 32, Hoyle further discloses retrieving a resource identifier (*banner01.gif, www.first_link.com*, Fig. 7) associated with the specific resource identified by the preference parameter (*unique ID* – col. 17, lines 1-21) from a map of resource identifiers (Fig. 7).

As per claim 33, Hoyle further discloses determining whether the preference specific resource is locally stored; retrieving the preference specific resource from the server system; and passing the preference specific resource to the software application as an argument (refer to claim 1, 2, and 3 for corresponding rejections).

As per claim 34, Hoyle discloses receiving into a server system a request to change a preference setting (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; col. 11, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62); and receiving into a client computer a preference parameter (e.g. steps *140-142* - Fig. 8) identifying the user interface preference.

As per claim 35, Hoyle discloses retrieving a resource identifier associated with the resource identified by the preference parameter (*banner01.gif, www.first_link.com*, Fig. 7) associated with the specific resource identified by the preference parameter (*unique ID* – col. 17, lines 1-21) from a map of resource identifiers (Fig. 7).

As per claim 36, Hoyle discloses determining; retrieving; and passing as claimed; which are similar to the features of claim 33 above; hence incorporate the same rejections as set forth above.

As per claim 50, Hoyle discloses an Internet browser toolbar displayed as part of an Internet browser interface (e.g. col. 9, lines 52-64; Fig. 5,5a); the browser comprising:

a graphical interface displayable as part of the internet browser interface, the graphical interface being generated through operation of a software application (e.g. Fig. 5, 5A);

the software application utilizing a first group of resources to generate the graphical interface according to a user preference (e.g. col. 9, lines 52-64; Fig. 5,5a – Note: every resources, e.g. ads banners, links used in a browser session prior to being replaced are first group of resources); and

a software implemented resource manager (e.g. *ADM module* – Fig. 1) operative with the software application to retrieve and make available to the said application a second group of resources in response to resource manager change in the user preference (e.g. Fig. 8,9; col. 17, lines 19-44), and wherein the second group of resources is retrieved from a remote server system (e.g. step *144* - Fig. 8; col. 17, lines 10-25)

Although Hoyle does not explicitly specify determining by the resource manager that the second group of resources is not locally stored for the second group of resources to be retrieved, this limitation is implicitly disclosed by Hoyle as have been mentioned in claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18, 20, 21, 37-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyle, USPN: 6,141,010, in view of Hetherington et al., USPN: 6,469,713 (hereinafter Hetherington).

As per claim 18, with respect to claim 16 above, Hoyle discloses the client computer receives geographic or regional-specific preference parameter from the server system but fails to

disclose that the preference is a language setting. Hetherington, in a method to produce a user interface and customizing of user preferences with resources managing method analogous to that disclosed by Hoyle, discloses a switching in language context based on messages (Fig. 2, 3a-b; col. 2, lines 20-38). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the demographic preference (i.e. *unique ID)* association with the resources in Hoyle's method so as to include a language preference parameter or setting as taught by Hetherington because this would enable remote support of users employing different languages or business-related transactions of disparate locales as intended by Hoyle via the use of wide area access URLs and ads data distribution.

As per claim 20, Hoyle discloses client-server system for permitting the region-specific linking (internationalization) of advertisements-related software applications, the client-server system comprising:

a server system having stored thereon a plurality of groups of resources (*Updated Components 48, Ad Database 44, Demographic Database* -- Fig. 3), each of the plurality of groups associated with a preference parameter (e.g. *Unique Identifier* - col. 5, lines 26-33; Fig. 8) , the server system maintaining a user profile database for storing the preference for a user (*User/Demographic Database 46*, Fig. 3); and

a client computer interconnected with the server system through a network (Fig. 3), the client computer having operative therein the software application (e.g. Fig. 5, 5a; *GUI Module* – Fig. 6) and a software implemented resource manager (e..g. *ADM module* – Fig. 1, 6), and

wherein in response to either a selected change in preference of a first user or in response to a second user with a different preference from the first user preference to use the application

on the client computer, the server transmits the preference parameter associated with the group of resources (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; *Unique Identifier* - col. 5, lines 26-33; Fig. 8 – Note: each user logging in on a browser and selecting of ads resources leading to different demographic data or parametric setup is equivalent to selected change of preference from first user but different from second user) corresponding to the change in preference to the client computer

such that the software resource manager can determine whether the group of resources associated with the preference parameter is stored locally on the client computer (e.g. col. 5, lines 26-35; col. 17, lines 10-25; Fig. 7; re claim 1 for rationale).

But Hoyle does not disclose that the preference parameter is a language preference parameter nor does Hoyle specify that the selected change in language preference by a second user is different from language preference of the first user's logging in, although Hoyle suggests accommodation of demographic differences by providing unique parameter associating specific demographic users data with the ads resources (e.g. col. 3, lines 4-6; *zip code* - col. 17, lines 13-21; col. 17, lines 39-44). Hetherington, in a method to produce a user interface and customizing of user preferences with resources managing method as mentioned in claim 18 above, discloses a switching in language context based on messages (Fig. 2, 3a-b; col. 2, lines 20-38). In view of the need to accommodate differences in language from one user to the next as suggested by demographic customizing by Hoyle, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the demographic preference (i.e. *unique ID)* association with the resources in Hoyle's method so as to include a language preference parameter or language customizing as taught by Hetherington to enable variation in language

setting upon log-in per user and support language accommodation for the benefits as mentioned in claim 18 above.

As per claim 21, Hoyle implicitly discloses the group of resources is retrieved from the server system if the group of resources is not stored locally on the client computer (re corresponding rejection set forth in claim 1).

As per claim 37, Hoyle discloses a method of adapting a user interface of a software application in a client server environment to a user's specific preference requirements (e.g. Fig. 8, 10-11) without the need to restart the application, comprising:

passing an item of data indicative of a user's preference requirement to a server system (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-25; col. 11, lines 57-67; col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62; *demographic* – col. 16, line 56 to col. 17, line 13);

identifying the resources necessary to generate the user interface (e.g. steps *140, 142, 144* – Fig. 8; col. 17, lines 13-26) in the user's required preference; and

making the necessary resources available to the program (Fig. 8,9; 5-5A; col. 16, lines 24-49).

However, Hoyle does not specify the preference requirements are language requirements. Hetherington, in a method to produce a user interface for customizing preferences with resources managing method analogous to that disclosed by Hoyle, discloses a language preference as a requirement for producing the user interface, just as mentioned in claim 18 above. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a language preference as a requirement as taught by Hetherington to the requirement for

setting an user interface in Hoyle system because of the same reasons as mentioned in claim 18 above.

As per claim 38, Hoyle discloses inputting into a client computer a user identifier associated with the user's preference requirement (e.g. *login module* – Fig. 4, 9 – Note: login session for download ads data is equivalent to inputting user identifier); and communicating the user identifier to the server system (e.g. step *136* – Fig. 8; *profile* - col. 16, lines 59-65 – Note: user credentials and demographic settings communicated to the server is equivalent to user identifier associated with user's preference requirement); but fails to disclose that the requirement is a language requirement. But this limitation has been disclosed by Hetherington as set forth in claim 18 above for the same reasons.

As per claim 39, Hoyle discloses that step (b) of claim 37 further comprises the receiving a preference parameter(e.g. steps 140-142- Fig. 8), retrieving a resource identifier (e.g. *banner01.gif*, Fig. 7; col. 17, lines 15-19) from a list of resources (Fig. 8; *Updated components 48* –Fig. 3). The user's required language preference limitation has been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this claim obvious for the same reasons set forth above.

As per claim 40, this claim has been addressed in claim 1 for being implicitly disclosed by Hoyle.

As per claim 41, Hoyle discloses a method of dynamically generating a user's preference-specific user interface of a software application deployed in a client server environment, comprising:

storing on a server system a plurality of user's preference-specific resources (*Updated Components 48, Ad Database 44, Demographic database* - Fig. 3);

receiving at a server system a request from a client computer (e.g. col. 16, lines 44-48, 59-62; col. 5, lines 24-25; Fig. 8) that the software application generate the user's preference-specific user interface;

receiving from the server system into the software application on the client computer (e.g. steps *140-142* – Fig. 8) a preference parameter associated with a user's preference-specific resource;

calling a function exposed by a resource manager (*ADM module* Fig. 6 ; *display, refresh, report, acquisition of advertising, data management* – col. 7, lines 4-14) instructing the resource manager to return the needed user's preference-specific resource to the software application (e.g. col. 15, lines 12-28);

determining whether the needed user's preference-specific resource is stored locally (re claim 1 for implicit disclosure by Hoyle).

But Hoyle **does not specify** that the user's preference-specific user interface or resource is a language-specific user interface of resource. However, this limitation has been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this instant claim obvious for the same reasons set forth therein.

As per claim 42, Hoyle discloses accessing an user profile database (e.g. col. 16, line 62 to col. 17, line 6); changing a preference setting stored in the user demographic (e.g. col. 17, lines 2-15); and setting the preference parameter based upon demographic setting (e.g. col. 17, lines 2-19; steps *136-142* - Fig. 8); **but fails to disclose** that the preference parameter and the setting of the user interface is based on a language-specific setting. But this limitation has been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this instant claim obvious for the same reasons set forth therein.

As per claim 43 and 44, Hoyle further discloses the (re claim 43) logging onto the server using a user identifier (*login module 60, user data storage 34*, Fig. 4), the user identifier being associated with a preference setting stored in the demographic database (e.g. col. 17, lines 2-15; Fig. 3, 8); pointing a (re claim 44) preference-specific resource, e.g. banner image, to the software application; linking to the preference-specific resource (e.g. col. 19, line 63 to col. 20, line 16; Fig. 10 --- Note: directing the application to where the resources are stored is equivalent to have a pointer); loading text strings and image data into memory of the client computer (e.g. col. 7, lines 32-37); and producing the preference-specific user interface using the text strings and image data (Fig. 5, 5a). However, Hoyle **does not disclose** that the user preference is a language-specific reference. But this limitation has been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this instant claim obvious for the same reasons set forth therein.

As per claim 45, Hoyle discloses a method of dynamically generating a preference-specific user interface of a software application deployed in a client server environment, comprising:

storing (preference-specific resources);

receiving (a request from a client);

receiving from the server system (a preference parameter);

determining (preference-specific resource is stored locally);

retrieving (preference-specific resource from the server) ;

passing (resource to the software application); and

generating (user interface).

All these limitations have been addressed in the corresponding rejections set forth in claim 41. However, Hoyle **fails to disclose** that the preference-specific resource and user interface are associated to a language-specific preference. But this limitation has also been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this instant claim obvious for the same reasons set forth therein.

As per claims 46 and 47, these are identical to the limitations of the respective claim 42 and 43, hence incorporate the respective rejections therein.

As per claims 48 and 49, Hoyle further discloses with reference to claim 45(f) calling a function (re claim 48) exposed by the software application (*ADM module* Fig. 6; *display, refresh, report, acquisition of advertising, data management* – col. 7, lines 4-14), and pointing to the preference-specific resource to the software application (e.g. col. 19, line 63 to col. 20, line 16; Fig. 10); and (re claim 49) with reference to claim 45(g) linking/pointing to the preference-specific resource (e.g. col. 19, line 63 to col. 20, line 16; Fig. 10), loading text strings and image data into memory of the client computer (e.g. col. 7, lines 32-37), and producing the language-specific user interface using the text strings and image data(e.g. Fig. 5, 5a). However, Hoyle **fails to disclose** that the preference-specific resource and user interface are associated to a language-specific preference. But this limitation has been addressed in claim 18 above, hence making this instant claim obvious for the same reasons set forth therein.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The following are the reasons therefor:

(A) As per arguments on generating a request by the user in claim 1, these amendments necessitate new grounds of rejections. As for the argument on blueprints (Applicant's Remarks, p. 10, top p. 11) the new ground of rejection based on addressing the newly added limitation as to generate a request by the user has directed the use of Hoyle's reference to new portions of Hoyle's invention.

(B) As per arguments on claim 8 (Applicant's Remarks, bottom p. 11, p. 12) and claims 15, 20 and 22 (Applicant's Remarks, p. 13, 14, 15), Examiner has addressed these claims in view of the direction taken when addressing claim 1 and has pointed to new parts of Hoyle's rejection, hence the arguments to these claims are moot as a consequence thereof.

(C) As per arguments on 35 USC 103(a) claims 18, 37-49 (Applicant's Remarks, p. 16-18), again, these are not of any effect in light of Examiner's new ground of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (703)305-7207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703)305-9662.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or: (703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA. , 22202. 4th Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

VAT
August 14, 2003

Todd Ingberg
Primary Examiner
Group 2100